

REMARKS

In the Office Action of July 14, 2003, the Examiner stated that the "Amendment and Request for Interference Under 37 C.F.R. §1.607" of February 11, 2003 (hereinafter "Amendment of February 11, 2003") was not fully responsive to the Office Action of November 15, 2002.

Apparently, this Office Action of July 14, 2003 is referring to the prior art rejections of the Office Action of November 15, 2002. These rejections are a 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection, or alternatively, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of Claims 28, 32 and 33 over the Belmont reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,421). Similarly, Claims 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the Belmont reference.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims do not claim the same invention as the Belmont reference, that the Belmont reference is "sworn behind" by the Rule 131 declaration included with the amendment of February 11, 2003. To the extent that the rejected claims may claim the same invention as the Belmont reference, the Applicant has requested the declaration of an interference with the Belmont reference. This request for a declaration of an interference was incorporated into the Amendment of February 11, 2003.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejections of Claims 28 and 30-33 are overcome and that all matters of the Office Action of November 15, 2003 have been responded to.

It is respectfully submitted that these arguments, at least in abbreviated form, were made in the second paragraph of page 11 of the Amendment of February 11, 2003.

Early examination and declaration of an interference is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*DRAFT - FOR DISCUSSION
ONLY*

Gerald Levy
Registration No. 24,419

Ronald E. Brown
Registration No. 32,200

Pitney, Hardin, Kipp & Szuch, L.L.P.
685 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10017
212-297-5800

OFFICIAL